

Message

From: Tsui-Bowen, Alethea [Tsui-Bowen.Alethea@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/7/2019 5:05:21 PM
To: Shewmake, Kenneth [shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov]
CC: Rauscher, Jon [Rauscher.Jon@epa.gov]
Subject: Review/comments on Conceptual Site Model Technical Memorandum, Lane Plating

Flag: Follow up

Hi Kenneth,

My review comments on the CSMT. Please let me know if you questions.

CSM (Figure 10) should have current and future receptors. Pls include the surface and subsurface soils depth info. Recreational (fishing and water activities) should be included as one of the receptors.

CSM (Figure 12) Reptiles & Amphibians have complete pathway in direct/dermal contact with surface water. Plants have complete pathway in direct/dermal contact with airborne dust. Animals (burrowing) have complete pathway in soil inhalation (subsurface).

Section 6 Data Gaps. "A subset of samples will also be analyzed for organics....if... COPCs should be expanded." Pls advise the list of organics.

On- and off-site groundwater well data can be used to provide groundwater gradient and flow maps.

Soil Sample Results table are missing footnotes for "Q", "D", "K", "H" etc.

Maps/figures using the data from the Soil Sample Results tables (Pgs 73-156) would be good to provide a better picture of the extent of the soil contamination (lateral and vertical). Maps/figures with exceedances should be provided.

Section 3.1 Surface Features, Paragraph 2, "No daycare facilities..... within 200 feet of the facility." Does it mean within 200 feet radius of the facility? 200 feet is about 0.037 mile which is pretty short. In Phase I investigation, 1 mile radius search is usually done.

Do we have background soil data for the area? Site-specific background soil data?

Do we have prevailing wind data around the site?

Tks & Rgds,
Alethea Tsui-Bowen